



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/484,278 02/26/90 NILSSEN

0
EXAMINER

OLE K. NILSSEN
CAESAR DRIVE
BARRINGTON, IL 60010

MIS,D
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

252
DATE MAILED:

2
07/26/90

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
- ☐ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
- ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
- ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
- ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- ☒ Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
- ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
- ☒ Claims 1-8 are rejected.
- ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
- ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
- ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
- ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
- ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).
- ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
- ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial No. 484,278

-2-

Art Unit 252

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- a) On page 1, lines 14-15, the application data should be updated since Serial No. 06/837,759 is now abandoned, and an FWC filed.
- b) On page 3, lines 14-15, the brief description of Fig. 5 should be deleted since there is no "Fig. 5" in the drawings. Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Spira et al, Galindo, and Nilssen '318 and '525.

Spira et al disclose a system for supplying power from a power supply to different lamps wherein an inverter is placed in

circuit between the power supply and a set of lines that distribute power to the lamps. Spira et al teach in column 5, lines 50-52 that any connection may be used between the inverter and lamps as long as the length is not too long. Galindo discloses a connection means incorporating tracks and is cited in the present specification. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate track means in the circuit disclosed by Spira et al as an equivalent for the connection means therein since the length of the tracks would permit their use. Spira et al disclose in column 7, lines 60-61, that any inverter may be used in their circuit 22. Nilssen '318 discloses an inverter which is referenced in the present specification as being analogous to the present inverter. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an inverter means as disclosed in Nilssen '318 in a circuit as taught by Spira et al incorporating track connection means as an equivalent for inverter 22. Nilssen '525 discloses another inverter analogous to the present inverter. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the inverter taught in Nilssen '525 in a circuit as taught by Spira et al incorporating track connection means as an equivalent for inverter 22.


Serial No. 484,278

-4-

Art Unit 252

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Mis at telephone number (703) 557-2325.

Mis/rk
July 24, 1990



DAVID MIS
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 252